

**RT&E SPECIES
WORK GROUP AGENDA
11 FEB 2003
Turkey Run GWMP**

<p>Purpose: To prioritize ranked species (state, federal, global) and identify specific threats to these species in such a way that allows us to meet the short- and long-term goals to sustain biodiversity within NCR.</p>

Expected Outcomes:

Evaluate list of RTE Species meeting Criteria 1-3
Select preliminary sites
Revised Action Plan and Time Table

Agenda:

1:00 Review legislation pertaining to RTE Species and our criterion.

1:30 Review short list of RTE Species.

2:00 Review potential RTE Sites.

2:30 Review Timeline and Next Steps

- Evaluate what information is needed to continue review process by Resource Managers.**

- Evaluate what information is needed to proceed with threats analysis or to develop monitoring program.**

3:30 Adjourn

Handouts: RTE NCR Species 1-28-03; RTE Analysis5; Feb11Agenda

Present: Doug Samson, Marie Frias, Dan Sealy, Bill Lellis, Diane Pavek, Brent Steury, Christina Wright, and Kent Schwarzkopf.

Facilitator: Marcus Koenen

A. Legislation Review.

The group discussion started by focusing on outcome one and reviewing the Criteria selected for prioritizing Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species. M. Koenen noted that although the RTE group agreed that NPS is legally mandated to preserve Federally listed T & E species and Maryland T & E Animals, it seemed that MD T & E plants and VA T & E species are also legally protected and should be included in the monitoring program. All species listed threatened or endangered by Maryland or Virginia were included in the most recent analysis of heritage data (See Appendix 1). Note that West Virginia and District of Columbia do not have a T & E species list. The result was, however, that many species were added to the RTE Criteria 1 that were previously not considered because of high G-Ranks (G4 and G5). While there was no consensus on whether or not to include these species in the Monitoring Program, Diane Pavek agreed to follow up on this issue with WASO T & E staff regarding if NPS was mandated to preserve state listed T & E species.

Until we receive input from WASO, it was agreed that we would maintain the current species list but would redo the analysis that listed the sites with most occurrences by breaking out how many species fell under which criteria. State listed T & E species would also be broken out and ranked according to their G-Ranks. Marcus Koenen will continue to work with Chris W. to accomplish this task.

B. Review Short List of Species

The group continued by discussion the current list of species in the spreadsheet that Marcus sent out. See “RTEAnalysis5” (Appendix 1) for how the data was derived from the heritage data covering our parks. The group also started to review the overhead maps produced by Christina Wright of species meeting the C1 Criteria (Federally listed species only). It was noted that the database contained more species than were mapped because site information was not available for all species. It was also noted that there continued to be errors in the data since some species such as the Hay’s Spring Amphipod were not listed on the map. It was shown on another map but should have met the C1 criteria. Brent, Dan, and Kent noted additional errors for their park data. Marcus and Chris agreed to try to fix all blatant errors. At a previous meeting, however, it was agreed that the database does have errors and was lacking recent data. The RTE group would, however, continue with an analysis and allow for a peer review later.

Instead of looking at each map by Criteria, it was suggested that it would be helpful to show all the species having one criteria on one map so that sites could be selected. This brought us into the next topic for discussion.

C. Review Potential Sites

The group turned to the site analysis that listed the sites with the most listed in the database. The sites were listed on the RTEAnalysis5 (Appendix 1) handout. It was noted that the sites listed were of various sizes and some such as Potomac Gorge might be extremely large. It was suggested that for the next meeting it would be worth listing the subsite names if the information was provided in the heritage database. If the subsite names were not available, it would be worth providing maps at the next meeting that zoomed into the larger sites. It was also noted that it would be difficult to prioritize sites without having the information about which species occur at which site.

D. Next Steps

The discussion was turned to what activities would need to be accomplished in order to continue to select sites.

1. Diane Pavsek will set up a conference call with WASO T & E staff to discuss the state listed T & E species. Marcus Koenen will join the call.
2. Marcus Koenen will work with Chris Wright to redo the site analysis by listing how many species meet which criteria at each site. This will be accomplished by the next meeting.
3. Chris would also get “Site Basic Records” from heritage for sites that contain numerous occurrences. The site information could provide important data regarding threats to the sites.
4. Next meeting has been set for 17 March. CUE will host the meeting to coincide with the I & M Turkey Fry. The focus of this meeting would be to review the sites with numerous occurrences and develop criteria for selecting priority sites. The criteria may include: Number of species with a certain criteria and/or 2. Level of threats. Marcus also hoped that the next meeting would help frame monitoring questions that might be incorporated into protocol development by a contractor or cooperator.

Appendix 1.

RTE Analysis 5 – Last Update: 1/28/03 (MK)

Species Analysis

Step 1. Reviewed heritage data for VA, MD, WV, and DC. Queried by all criteria starting with Fed listed T & E. Then selected State T & E. Then selected remaining species meeting Criterion 2-3. (Note that this list now includes State listed T & E plant species for VA and MD).

Step 2. Deleted occurrences unless it had EO Rank A, B, or C (including CD).

Step 3. Reviewed data provided by parks and added additional species meeting criteria 1-3.

Step 4. Reviewed data provided by Kent S. for APPA and added additional species meeting criteria 1-3.

Step 5. Reviewed VDGIF Database and added species meeting criteria 1-3.

Step 6. Put all data into spreadsheet named NCR RTE 1-28-03.

Step 7. Removed duplicates. For example, species ranked G1G2 may show up under both Criterion 2 and 3.

The resulting spreadsheet included 370 “viable” occurrences as follows:

C1Fed – 17 occurrences
C1 State (Plants) - 252 occurrences
C1 State (Animals) - 30
C2 – 20 occurrences
C3 – 51 occurrences

Site Summary.

Several sites contain multiple occurrences. Those sites with >2 occurrences are listed below:

Sites with 89 Occurrences

-POTOMAC GORGE

Sites with 18 Occurrences

-CHOH

Sites with 12 occurrences

-OUTDOOR CLUB SHALE BARRENS

- ROUNDTOP HILL

Sites with 11 occurrences

GWMP (includes two Great Falls sites)

Sites with 10 occurrences

- CATO (including two specific sites in the park)

Sites with 9 occurrences

-KASECAMP SHALE BARRENS

-NACE

Sites with 8 occurrences

-HAFE

Sites with Six Occurrences

- FERRY HILL LIMESTONE CLIFFS
- ROCR

Sites with Five Occurrences

- DAM NUMBER THREE SCOUR BAR
- Little Pool
- SIDELING HILL CREEK MACROSITE
- THE NECK

Sites with Four Occurrences

- Bevan Bend Shale Barren
- CANAL BOTTOMLAND
- LOCK 29 FLOODPLAIN
- LONG'S HUNT CLUB SHALE GLADES
- SNYDERS LANDING WEST
- SUITLAND BOG
- SYCAMORE LANDING RIVERSIDE
- MONO (including two at Monocacy Spring)

Sites with Three Occurrences

- Fort Duncan
- HUNTING CREEK HOLLOW
- NOLANDS FERRY FLOODPLAIN
- OLDTOWN ROMNEY SHALE GLADE
- POWELL BEND
- PRINCE WILLIAM FOREST PARK
- TURKEY RUN PARK SLOPES
- Weverton Floodplain